

But even viewed as realpolitik, our benign attitude toward Venezuela's coup was remarkably foolish.

It is very much in our interest that Latin America break out of its traditional political cycle, in which crude populism alternated with military dictatorship. Everything that matters to the U.S.—trade, security drugs, you name it—will be better if we have stable neighbors.

But how can such stability be achieved? In the 1990's there seemed, finally, to be a formula; call it the new world order. Economic reform would end the temptations of populism; political reform would end the risk of dictatorship. And in the 1990's, on their own initiative but with encouragement from the United States, most Latin American nations did indeed embark on a dramatic process of reform both economic and political.

The actual results have been mixed. On the economic side, where hopes were initially highest, things have not gone too well. There are no economic miracles in Latin America, and there have been some notable disasters, Argentina's crisis being the latest. The best you can say is that some of the disaster victims, notably Mexico, seem to have recovered their balance (with a lot of help, one must say, from the Clinton administration) and moved onto a path of steady, but modest, economic growth.

Yet economic disasters have not destabilized the region. Mexico's crisis in 1995, Brazil's crisis in 1999, even Argentina's current crisis did not deliver those countries into the hands either of radicals or of strongmen. The reason is that the political side has gone better than anyone might have expected. Latin America has become a region of democracies—and these democracies seem remarkably robust.

So while the U.S. may have hoped for a new Latin stability based on vibrant prosperity, what it actually got was stability despite economic woes, thanks to democracy. Things could be a lot worse.

Which brings us to Venezuela. Mr. Chávez is a populist in the traditional mold, and his policies have been incompetent and erratic. Yet he was fairly elected, in a region that has come to understand the importance of democratic legitimacy. What did the United States hope to gain from his overthrow? True, he has spouted a lot of anti-American rhetoric, and been a nuisance to our diplomacy. But he is not a serious threat.

Yet there we were, reminding everyone of the bad old days when any would-be right-wing dictator could count on U.S. backing.

As it happens, we aligned ourselves with a peculiarly incompetent set of plotters. Mr. Chávez has alienated a broad spectrum of his people; the demonstrations that led to his brief overthrow began with a general strike by the country's unions. But the short-lived coup-installed government included representatives of big business and the wealthy—full stop. No wonder the coup collapsed.

But even if the coup had succeeded, our behavior would have been very stupid. We had a good thing going—a new hemispheric atmosphere of trust, based on shared democratic values. How could we so casually throw it away?

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 2002]

U.S. SEEN AS WEAK PATRON OF LATIN DEMOCRACY

(By Karen DeYoung)

The Bush administration said yesterday that its policy toward the dizzying events in Venezuela had been fully in tune with the rest of the hemisphere, and that it will continue to work with its Latin American partners to preserve Venezuelan democracy and justice.

"We'll be guided by the Inter-American Democratic Charter," said State Department spokesman Philip Reeker, referring to the Organization of American States' seven-month-old agreement to condemn and investigate the overthrow of any democratically elected OAS member government and, if necessary, suspend the offender's membership.

But much of the rest of the hemisphere saw the administration's response to the last five days in Venezuela in a somewhat different light. In the view of a number of Latin American governments, they were the ones who rose to defend democracy, while the United States came limping along only when it became clear late Saturday that the Friday morning coup against Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez had only temporarily succeeded.

"The United States handled it badly, as is its wont," said a former Mexican official with close ties to the government of President Vicente Fox. U.S. policy, he said, is "multilateralism a la carte and democracy a la carte."

A senior administration official yesterday repeated denials of allegations by Chavez supporters that the United States had encouraged the coup, although he acknowledged that U.S. officials had met with a number of Chavez opponents. "They came here . . . to complain and to inform us and to tell us about the situation," he said. "We said we can't tell you to remove a president or not to remove a president . . . we did not wink, not even wink at anyone."

Few Latin American officials appeared to believe the United States was involved.

But they expressed a rueful lack of surprise at what they saw as the administration's failure, despite President Bush's frequent statements on the importance of hemispheric relations, to publicly oppose it once it happened.

Instead, diplomats concentrated on what the Latin Americans had done themselves, saying they were pleased that the OAS, a plodding, historically powerless body that has long been dominated by Washington, had actually managed to convene an emergency meeting on Saturday, adopt a strong resolution condemning both the coup and the violence that led up to it—apparently instigated by Chavez backers—and dispatch its secretary general on a fact-finding mission to Venezuela.

They were pleased that, despite their near-universal dislike of Chavez, a left-leaning populist who has irritated or worried most of them, they had defended democratic principles that have been so often violated in many of their own countries.

"It's an example of how it should work," said a diplomat who asked not to be named.

As recently as Friday, President Bush hailed the Democratic Charter in the White House's annual Pan-American Day proclamation, calling it an antidote to terror. The charter was approved by the 34 OAS member nations in Lima, Peru, on Sept. 11, the day of the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. Secretary of State Colin L. Powell attended the gathering, but had to leave early to attend to more pressing matters in Washington.

The charter put more teeth in an earlier OAS democracy declaration signed in Santiago, Chile, in 1991. It was invoked on a number of occasions by President George H.W. Bush, and by President Bill Clinton, when unconstitutional actions threatened the governments of Peru, Paraguay, Guatemala and Ecuador over the last decade. The current Bush administration has referred to the documents as symbols of the democracy that now prevails in all but one nation in the hemisphere, Cuba.

Yet the first time elected governance was interrupted under Bush's watch, his adminis-

tration punted. Last Friday, South American presidents attending an unrelated meeting in Costa Rica broke off to sign a resolution condemning the apparent coup that had overthrown Chavez that morning and invoking the Inter-American Democratic Charter. As they were composing the document, White House spokesman Ari Fleischer was announcing in Washington that Chavez had provoked the crisis and resigned. "A transitional civilian government has been installed," Fleischer said. "This government has promised early elections." There was no mention of the Democratic Charter.

Most member countries have ambassadors at OAS headquarters here in addition to their envoys to the U.S. government. But while the OAS prepared Friday afternoon to convene an emergency meeting required under the charter, the Bush administration summoned all the hemisphere's bilateral ambassadors to a State Department briefing. According to several participants, Assistant Secretary Otto J. Reich told them the United States did not approve of coups and had not promoted this one, but that Chavez had it coming.

When the OAS meeting began Saturday morning, a Caracas businessman was occupying the presidential palace. Roger Noriega, the U.S. ambassador to the OAS, took the floor to chastise member states for being less concerned about Chavez's anti-democratic behavior over the past 24 months than events of the last 24 hours.

But as the day wore on, Venezuela's new president started taking some anti-democratic actions of his own, dissolving the National Assembly, shutting the Supreme Court and voiding the constitution. Chavez supporters flooded the streets.

"As it started to unravel," a diplomat said, "the United States became less and less eager to try to lead" the debate.

When Sunday morning found Chavez back in power in Caracas, Latin American governments hailed it as a victory for democracy. White House national security adviser Condoleezza Rice told NBC's "Meet the Press" viewers that she hoped Chavez had learned his lesson.

At the State Department, Reeker described the Venezuelan situation as "fluid," and said the administration was continuing to monitor it. The important thing, he said, "is the mission of the OAS. We want the OAS and the Democratic Charter that countries of the region signed up to play an important role in this process."

DOOLITTLE'S RAIDERS REUNION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and included extraneous material.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 60th anniversary of the famous Tokyo raid conducted by Doolittle's Raiders, highlighted by a reunion of this courageous contingent being held in Columbia, South Carolina. General Woody Randal and hundreds of dedicated volunteers have organized a week-long tribute to our Raider heroes.

The Raiders were assembled in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor, and trained at Columbia Army Airfield by the visionary General Jimmy Doolittle for their courageous service, which was crucial to raise America's shocked wartime spirits. The raid had profound

strategic consequences for America's ultimate victory.

South Carolina is especially proud of native son First Lieutenant William G. Farrow of Darlington. Lieutenant Darrow was one of eight members of Doolittle's Raiders who were captured by the Japanese. He endured 6 months of brutal torture and deprivation before being executed at age 25. Lieutenant Farrow's ultimate sacrifice will never be forgotten, and his influence continues with his authorship as a student at the University of South Carolina of "An American Creed for Victory."

As we honor Doolittle's Raiders for their courageous sacrifices for our Nation during World War II, it is my hope that Lieutenant Farrow's patriotic words will inspire all generations of Americans to serve their country with pride and honor.

The document referred to is as follows:

Farrow's Creed

After Raider Lieutenant William Farrow's execution on October 15, 1942, his mother found this list in a trunk belonging to him. President Franklin D. Roosevelt touted the list as an example to the Nation. It was printed in newspapers and church bulletins coast to coast.

MY FUTURE (LATER CALLED "AN AMERICAN'S CREED FOR VICTORY").

First, what are my weaknesses?

- (1) Lack of thoroughness and application.
- (2) Lack of curiosity.
- (3) Softness in driving myself.
- (4) Lack of constant diligence.
- (5) Lack of seriousness of purpose—sober thought.
- (6) Scatter-brained dashing here and there and not getting anything done—spur-of-the-moment stuff.
- (7) Letting situations confuse the truth in my mind.
- (8) Lack of self-confidence.
- (9) Letting people influence my decisions too much. I must weigh my decisions—then act.
- (10) Too much frivolity—not enough serious thought.

(1) Lack of clear-cut, decisive thinking.

Second, what must I do to develop myself?

- (1) Stay in glowing health—take a good, fast one-hour workout each day.
- (2) Search out current, past and future topics on aviation.
- (3) Work hard on each day's lessons—shoot for an "A."
- (4) Stay close to God—do His will and commandments. He is my friend and protector. Believe in Him—trust in His ways—not in my own confused understanding of the universe.
- (5) Do not waste energy or time in fruitless pursuits—learn to act from honest fundamental motives—simplicity in life leads to the fullest living. Order my life—in order, there is achievement, in aimlessness, there is retrogression.
- (6) Fear nothing—be it insanity, sickness, failure—always be upright—look the world in the eye.
- (7) Keep my mind always clean—allow no evil thoughts to destroy me. My mind is my very own, to think and use just as I do my arms. It was given to me by the Creator to use as I see fit, but to think wrong is to do wrong!
- (8) Concentrate! Choose the task to be done, and do it to the best of my ability.
- (9) Fear not for the future—build on each day as though the future for me is a cer-

tainty. If I die tomorrow, that is too bad, but I will have done today's work!

(10) Never be discouraged over anything! Turn failure into success.

□ 1745

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

**SUPREME COURT RULING
THREATENS OUR CHILDREN**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JEFF MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, 20 years ago, the Supreme Court recognized the compelling State and national interest in protecting American children, declaring that child pornography is barred from first amendment protection. Since that time, Congress has worked consistently to protect against the exploitation of our children, a charge that has become increasingly difficult in the computer age.

Yesterday, the court struck down Congress's attempt at a legislative crackdown against computer-age child pornography, calling it a threat to free speech. Justice Kennedy's broad language sends a disturbing message. The high court in our land apparently places a higher premium on the expression of pedophiles than on ensuring the psychological, emotional, and mental health of our country's children and society as a whole.

Child pornography is a highly organized, multi-million dollar industry in this country, involving the exploitation of thousands of children and youth in the production and distribution of pornographic materials. In 1996, Congress addressed the mushroom effect of high-tech kiddie porn by passing the Child Pornography Prevention Act. The law broadened the scope of the definition of child pornography to include computer-generated issues. Computers are increasingly being used to alter innocent pictures of children to create visuals of those children engaging in sexual conduct. This type of child pornography invades the child's privacy and reputational interests. Images that are created showing a child's face on a body engaging in sexually explicit conduct can haunt the minor for years.

As articulated by the court's dissenters, The Child Pornography Pre-

vention Act prohibition of virtual child pornography was tailored narrowly enough to pass constitutional muster. It is clear that the Act merely extends existing prohibitions on child pornography to a class of computer-generated pictures that may be easily mistaken for actual photographs of real children. Yesterday, the court turned its back on its long-standing recognition of the government's compelling interest in protecting American children. That interest is promoted by Congress's efforts to ban virtual child pornography. Such images whet the appetites of child molesters who may use the images to seduce young children.

Anger to children who are seduced and molested with the aid of child sex pictures is just as great when the child pornographer or child molester uses visuals of child sexual activity produced wholly or in part by electronic or computer means, as when molesters use images of actual children engaging in sexually explicit conduct.

Despite the Supreme Court's decision, Congress is not required to, nor will it wait, on harm to our children before legislating against it. I echo Attorney General John Ashcroft's disappointment in the ruling and that child pornographers and pedophiles can find little refuge in the court's decision. Ensuring enforceability of our American child pornography laws is indeed a compelling one, and the Child Pornography Prevention Act is an important tool in fighting child sexual abuse.

We will continue to fight to ban expression which is used by sex abusers to act in deviance with children and which desensitizes the offenders themselves to the pathology of sexual abuse and exploitation of children. The First Amendment does not protect the panderer.

**OPPOSING THE ADMINISTRATION'S
PROPOSED WORK REQUIREMENTS
UNDER TANF REAUTHORIZATION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the President and Republican leadership proposals for TANF reauthorization. On February 26, the administration announced an agenda for welfare reform to strengthen families and help more recipients work towards independence and self reliance. In keeping with the principles outlined by President Bush, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, introduced H.R. 4090, the Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Promotion Act of 2002 on April 9. On that same day, the gentleman from California